

Please add the following new claims:

21. (New) The method of claim 16, further comprising retrieving said personal scheduling information from said personal organizer unit using function keys located on said mobile handset.

22. (New) The handset of claim 12, wherein said audible alert notification feature is activated by a prescheduled event from said organizer data.

#### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1 – 20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 8, 10 and 16 are amended herein. Support for these amendments is taken from the specification, *inter alia*, at page 20, lines 20 – 24. In addition, claim 1 includes the “display screen” recited in claim 8. Claim 8 has been amended accordingly.

New claims 21 and 22 are directed to additional embodiments of the invention. Claim 21 recites the retrieval of personal scheduling information from the

handset. Claim 22 is directed to the alert function of the handset. Support therefor may be found on page 6 of the specification at lines 18 – 21, for example.

Entry of the foregoing amendments and new claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 – 7 and 10 – 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Henderson, U.S. Patent No. 6,035,214. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Among other shortcomings, Henderson fails to disclose a display screen on his device. Since the reference fails to disclose at least one component of the claimed invention, it can not sustain an anticipation rejection. Withdrawal of the §102 rejection is therefore accordingly urged for at least this reason.

Claims 8 - 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Henderson '214 in view of Peyer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,953,413. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Henderson relates to a telephone – that also happens to be hooked up to a computer. The entire device was designed for the convenience of making telephone calls while working at a computer station. The user can place calls from the telephone via the computer's modem card, if desired. Likewise, incoming calls may be routed through the computer to the telephone. If the telephone rings while the user is at the computer station, he or she can then easily answer the phone without getting up from the computer. Henderson's device also allows one to gain access to the Internet, again via a modem.

What Henderson fails to teach or even suggest is a computer-integrated, detachable personal organizer. Until applicant's invention, most people had to organize their personal scheduling information, e.g. appointments, date book, meetings, etc., twice – once into their personal computer for use at their desk, and again into a hand-held personal organizer for use while they traveled. They could not simply program this data once by making entries from their computer keyboard, with the information then being transmitted and stored into a hand-held organizer for later use. Moreover, they had no means by which to either remotely program the computer or alert themselves of a scheduled event.

In short, Henderson does not even recognize the problem which the present applicant has solved. Henderson merely addresses the issue of placing and receiving phone calls from a computer. The reference would not have provided any guidance in organizing one's scheduling information and appointment calendar conveniently and easily.

Moreover, Peyer does not rectify Henderson's deficiencies. Peyer merely provides a more detailed description of the various features of a telephone that may be used in a computer/telephone system. These features include "send" and "end" call buttons, as well as a power switch, for example. What Peyer does not suggest is an organizer system and method that allows a user to program scheduling information from his computer and retrieve it from a handset later on. Peyer also fails to provide any guidance on a remote-

activated alert system, one which would let the user know that the time for a previously scheduled event had arrived.

Thus, the disclosures of Henderson and Peyer, whether alone or in combination, would not have led the skilled artisan to the presently claimed invention. Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is therefore respectfully urged.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and prompt, favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Dated: September 21, 2000

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

John F. Levis

Registration No.: 34,210

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant